

*Frank C. DeFelice*  
32 Cherry Lane  
Durham, Connecticut 06422  
Telephone: 860-690-2400  
*fcdefelice@aol.com*

Energy and Technology Committee  
Room 3900, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106

February 7, 2013

**Opposition to SB-807: An Act Concerning Water Infrastructure and Conservation, The Department Of Public Health, Municipal Reporting Requirements and Unpaid Utility Accounts at Multi-Family Dwellings**

Dear Senators and Representatives,

My name is Frank C. DeFelice, and I am a Planning & Zoning Commissioner and Certified Inland Wetland & Watercourses Commissioner in the Town of Durham, Connecticut and so wanted to communicate my thoughts on the aforementioned bill to you.

First, this bill will surely result in increased water prices, for those who are served by Public Water Systems. The additional cost would be inequitably borne by our state's poorer and younger residents; because it is these groups who typically reside in areas of higher population density (e.g.: cities), which are served by Public Water Systems (as opposed to Private Wells). Already, a large cost disparity exists for those who receive their water from public water systems as opposed to private wells; and this bill is certain to exacerbate this disparity.

Second, this bill proposes to insert new language into Section 8-3i of the Connecticut General Statutes which would require that applicants to Planning and Zoning Commissions or Zoning Boards of Appeal provide notice to the Local Water Company and to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) for "any project on any site". Thus, an applicant who is appearing for a simple sign application, the placement of a small shed-type building within a setback area, the construction of a residence, or the desire to devote part of their existing residence to an in-law apartment, would reasonably be required to fulfill this notice obligation; since the average applicant would not know whether a map of the watershed area had or had not been filed; and so filed, would not know if they were or were not within the Defined Watershed Area without performing an A-2 survey. The Notice Process would likely require that PURA add staff to manage the large inflow and processing of these notices (requiring a Fiscal Note).

Third, and most importantly, "watersheds" are orders-of-magnitude larger than are "aquifer protection areas". This change in language (from "aquifer protection area" to "watershed") would impact many, many more persons. Remember that a watershed area can be extremely large, and may cross municipal or even state borders. Watersheds observe no particular property boundaries, and are fluid; changing from year to year. And abutting landowners have no mean to say; or means of recourse to address, where a water company chooses to define the boundaries of its watershed.

If your goal is to conserve water, I would suggest that you look instead at revising the current business models of Connecticut's Public Water Companies. These business models are predicated on developing an ever-increasing customer base through continued expansion of their distribution systems. This business model is a poor one; and will surely impact our environment in a negative way; because it encourages development along these new lines; resulting in a net increase in water consumption. Extending public water lines, as is currently proposed from Middletown to Durham or from the Farmington River to the University of Connecticut, simply reduces our state's diversity-of-supply, resulting in security concerns; and ultimately leading to increased water consumption.

I respectfully urge you to oppose this bill.

*Frank C. DeFelice*